Printing Petrarch in the Mid-Cinquecento: Giolito, Vellutello and Collaborative Authorship

Author: Rhiannon Daniels

Institution: University of Bristol

Email: r.j.daniels@bristol.ac.uk

Abstract

This article uses the theory of collaborative authorship to evaluate the ways in which multiple authorities operate within the pages of sixteenth-century editions of Petrarch's *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* (*Rvf*) and *Triumphi* printed by Gabriele Giolito. These authorities include Petrarch as author of the poems, Vellutello as author of the commentary, and the printer-publisher Giolito, whose publishing enterprise creates additional paratexts and frames the project through its visual-material design decisions. I argue that the dynamics of textual design demonstrate that the authority vested in the edition rests on the role played by Giolito, as much as on that of Vellutello or Petrarch. The making of a text-object is a collective enterprise that encourages us to look beyond the figures of canonical individuals and attribute creative agency to aspects of the publishing industry which are often less visible to the critical gaze.

Keywords: Petrarch, Vellutello, Giolito, collaborative authorship, paratext, page design

Printing Petrarch in the Mid-Cinquecento: Giolito, Vellutello and Collaborative Authorship

In 1544, the Venetian printer-publisher Gabriele Giolito produced his first edition of Petrarch's *Rvf* and *Triumphi*, incorporating Alessandro Vellutello's already-published commentary.[1] The title-page announces the contents in two sections: at the top of the page, in the largest uppercase font, 'IL PETRARCHA' stands for both the author and his texts; and this is followed by a more detailed explanation of the paratextual accompaniment in a slightly smaller uppercase (see Figure 1). What is striking about the title-page is not its wording, but rather the visual features of its woodcut design. Although the names of Petrarch and Vellutello are more prominent than the name of the publisher, which is provided in the smallest font size and placed at the foot of the page, it is Giolito's publishing house which is given centre stage. Dominating the middle of the page is the image of a phoenix with outstretched wings, rising from the flames emitted from an urn bearing the initials G[abriele]. G[iolito]. F[errari]. An elaborate architectural façade frames the mythological bird and creates a trompe l'oeil effect in which the title of the work appears on top of and suspended within the design. Thus the phoenix – Giolito – and its architectural frame – the book – literally and metaphorically present and support Petrarch and Vellutello.[2] The dominant

[1] Editions published by Giolito include the *Rvf* followed by the *Triumphi* and a selection of the so-called '*disperse*' in the same volume. References in this essay are therefore to the combined texts of the *Rvf*, *Triumphi*, and *Disperse* unless otherwise specified. Vellutello's commentary was first published in 1525: see note below.

[2] Notice of a privilege is entwined around the garland above the phoenix: 'Con gratia et privilegio'. On the mottos associated with Giolito's printer's device, see Angela Nuovo, 'Il marchio e l'organizzazione commerciale', in Angela Nuovo and Christian Coppens, *I Giolito e la stampa nell'Italia del XVI secolo* (Geneva: Droz, 2005), pp. 125–71; Angela Nuovo, *The Book Trade in the Italian Renaissance*, trans. by Lydia G. Cochrane (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 154–58.

presence of Giolito on the title-page provides a prompt to review the relationship between author, commentator, and printer-publisher.

Petrarch's vernacular lyrics were an early bestseller in Italy in the age of print, appearing in at least thirty-five incunables, and a further 148 sixteenth-century editions.[3] The first commentary on Petrarch was composed in the 1420s and circulated in manuscript, but most of the 'major' commentaries were composed for print and circulated in printed editions.[4] The commentary authored by Alessandro Vellutello, and first published in print in 1525, was the most frequently reprinted commentary of the sixteenth century, published by several different printer-publishers in Venice before it was incorporated into the first edition of Petrarch published by Gabriele Giolito in 1544.[5] Giolito was one of the most successful and longest-working publishers of vernacular material. His editions of Petrarch were published in an intense sixteen-year period between 1544 and 1560, during which time he produced 24 editions (see Table 1).[6]

---

[3] I have used the figures given in Michele Carlo Marino, 'Il paratesto nelle edizioni del *Canzoniere* e dei *Trionfi*', in *Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio, e il paratesto: le edizioni rinascimentali delle 'tre corone'* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 2006), pp. 51–76 (p. 54). The numbers of incunables are significantly revised upwards in Guyda Armstrong's article in this mini-special issue of *Italian Studies*, 'Rematerializing the Incunable Petrarch: Ernest Hatch Wilkins and the Politics of Bibliographical Description'.

[4] See William J. Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 2–3.

[5] Giovanni Antonio Nicolini da Sabbio and brothers, 1525; Bernardino Vitali, 1528 and 1532; Bartolomeo Zanetti ad instantia di Alessandro Vellutello and Giovanni Giolito, 1538; Comin da Trino ad instantia di Vincenzo Valgrisi and Giovanni Francesi, 1541; Giovanni Antonio Nicolini da Sabbio, 1541.

[6] On Giolito, see Nuovo and Coppens; Amedeo Quondam, '"Mercanzia d'onore"/"mercanzia d'utile": produzione libraria e lavoro intellettuale a Venezia nel Cinquecento', in *Libri, editori e pubblico nell'Europa moderna: guida storica e critica*, ed. by Armando Petrucci (Rome, Laterza, 1977), pp. 51–104; Brian Richardson, *Print Culture in Renaissance Italy: The Editor and the Vernacular Text, 1470-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 109–18. Table 1 is compiled using *Censimento delle edizioni italiane del XVI secolo* (EDIT16) — from which the CNCE numbers derive — <http://edit16.iccu.sbn.it> [accessed 22 October 2019]; *Universal Short Title Catalogue* (USTC) <http://ustc.ac.uk> [accessed 22 October 2019]; *PERI* <https://petrarch.mml.ox.ac.uk/> [accessed 22 October 2019]. Several editions contain two different dates, i.e. 1553 on the title-page for the *Rvf* and 1554 on the title-page of the *Triumphi*; in these cases I have included both dates (e.g. 1553 to

The influence of Petrarch on sixteenth-century readers, many of whom approached the text in printed editions with commentaries by Vellutello (and others), and the spread of Petrarchism across Europe are well documented.[7] Similarly, Giolito's contribution to the development of the print trade in early modern Italy has been explored in some depth, and the role that he played in the canonization of modern authors, including Petrarch, has been highlighted in broad terms. In this article, I aim to develop our understanding of the way in which Giolito's organization of the paratextual apparatus, and thus his command of the graphic design of his editions, as well as their contents, framed the way in which readers approached Petrarch in the mid-Cinquecento. In so doing, I am building on the discussion initiated by Daniel Javitch in 1998, who evaluated for the first time what he termed the 'packaging of Giolito's texts'.[8]

1554). See also Klaus Ley, Christine Mundt-Espin and Charlotte Krauss, *Die Drucke von Petrarcas 'Rime', 1470-2000: synoptische Bibliographie der Editionen und Kommentare, Bibliotheksnachweise* (Hildesheim: Olms, 2002); Marco Santoro, Michele Carlo Marino, and Marco Pacioni, '*Commedia*, *Canzoniere/Trionfi*, *Decameron*: Short-Title 1465–1600 delle edizioni italiane', in *Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio e il paratesto*, pp. 99–135 ('Edizioni dei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*', pp. 109–27). This latter short-title catalogue is missing some of the editions which include Camillo's annotations. A Giolito edition edited by Dolce in 1551 is listed in Santoro, Marino, and Pacioni, and in Mary Fowler, *Catalogue of the Petrarch Collection Bequeathed by Willard Fiske* (London: Oxford University Press, 1916), p. 102; this is no longer listed in EDIT16 or USTC and I have not found any details of a 1551 edition elsewhere. Giolito also published anthologies of letters, including by Petrarch: *Epistole di Gaio Plinio, di messer Francesco Petrarca, del signor Pico della Mirandola et d'altri eccellentissimi huomini* (Venice: Gabriele Giolito, 1548), CNCE 21640; USTC 849918; and anthologies of vernacular lyrics chosen mostly from contemporary poets, which conveyed the Petrarchan style: see Louise George Clubb and William G. Clubb, 'Building a Lyric Canon: Gabriel Giolito and the Rival Anthologists, 1545-1590: Part I', *Italica*, 68.3 (1991), 332–44.

[7] See for example, Amadeo Quondam, *Petrarchismo mediato: per una critica della forma 'antologia'* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1974); Gino Belloni, *Laura tra Petrarca e Bembo: studi sul commento umanistico-rinascimentale al 'Canzoniere'* (Padua: Antenore, 1992); Luigi Balsamo, 'Chi leggeva le cose volgari del Petrarca nell'Europa del '400 e '500', *La Bibliofilía*, 104.3 (2002), 247–66; William Kennedy, *The Site of Petrarchism: Early Modern National Sentiment in Italy, France, and England* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); *Il petrarchismo: un modello di poesia per l'Europa*, ed. by Loredana Chines, 2 vols (Rome: Bulzoni, 2006).

[8] Daniel Javitch, 'Gabriel Giolito's "Packaging" of Ariosto, Boccaccio and Petrarch in the mid-Cinquecento', in *Studies for Dante: Essays in Honor of Dante Della Terza*, ed. by Franco Fido (Florence: Cadmo, 1998), pp. 123–33 (p. 123).

We have already seen the way in which Giolito used a title-page to 'package' his 1544 edition of Petrarch, thereby signalling clearly that it contained the work not only of Petrarch and his commentator, Vellutello, but also his own work as a printer-publisher. Another example of paratextual packaging immediately follows the title-page in the same edition: this is a letter to the reader signed by Lodovico Domenichi, one of the editors who regularly worked for Giolito.[9] The presence of Domenichi's name affords him some visibility, although the exact roles that he played in the creation of this edition and others is still subject to speculation. The letter is concerned primarily with praising the quality of Giolito's publications and the part that they played in making available the texts of the best authors. How much freedom did Domenichi exercise to choose this subject matter (assuming that he did actually write it)?[10] Does his name on the letter indicate that he also edited Petrarch's text? Did he write the sonnet in praise of Petrarch and Laura which appears on the following leaf? It is as difficult to answer these questions as it is to specify exactly what Giolito's role was in the making of editions published under his imprint. Furthermore, editions are not only the product of named authors, commentators, publishers, and editors,

[9] Fol. A2[r]. On Domenichi as author and editor, see Angela Piscini's entry in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, XL (1991), 595–600; Deanna Shemek, 'The Collector's Cabinet: Lodovico Domenichi's Gallery of Women', in *Strong Voices, Weak History: Early Women Writers and Canons in England, France, and Italy*, ed. by Pamela Joseph Benson and Victoria Kirkham (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005), pp. 239–62; Laura Prelipcean, 'Dialogic Construction and Interaction in Lodovico Domenichi's *La nobilità delle donne*', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 39.2 (2016), 61–83; Marco Faini, 'Building the Chivalric Canon: Teofilo Folengo, Lodovico Domenichi, and Aretino's Silence', *Italian Studies*, 74.2 (2019), 148–57.

[10] It is certainly likely that Giolito signed letters which were composed by his collaborators: Nuovo and Coppens, p. 96. In 1562, Domenichi authored a dialogue on printing (published by Giolito), which again praised the work of Giolito, as well as that of Aldo Manuzio: *Dialoghi di M. Lodovico Domenichi, cioè d'amore, de' rimedi d'amore, dell'amor fraterno, della fortuna, della vera nobiltà, dell'imprese, della corte, et della stampa* (Venice: Gabriele Giolito, 1562).

but have also been shaped by unnamed compositors, pressmen and women, and proofreaders, all of whom have contributed to the packaging of the text.[11]

While we cannot always name the agents involved, we can see the results of their decisions. The presence of paratextual material – as well as the editorial presentation of Petrarch's text – is the product of the collective work which has taken place in the print shop, and allows us to see what kinds of work have been carried out, even when it is difficult to attribute direct responsibility for its creation. Paratexts in early modern editions of Petrarch range from full-length commentaries and lives of the author, through to dedications and letters addressed to the reader, and down to tables, indexes, running titles, and numbering systems designed to help readers navigate their way through the text.[12] Some of these paratexts are inherited from the manuscript tradition, but many were produced specifically by book agents working in the service of the printing press. Their presence points to the communities of readers and makers which ebb and flow through editions, editing, revising, adding new texts, and commenting on previous interventions, forming layers of accretions and shaping the text in a similar way to communities of manuscript writers and readers.

Rather than focus on one aspect of packaging material, it can be equally productive to explore holistically the full range of paratextual apparatus included within a single edition. Commentaries are one of the most visible forms of paratext surrounding Petrarch's text, and have come to stand for a relatively privileged, almost 'elite' form of packaging, which is connected to named individuals (such as Vellutello). The way in which a commentary creates a particular access point to Petrarch's *Rvf* or *Triumphi* is only one aspect of the way in which

[11] In his letter to the readers, Domenichi also alludes to other collaborators or agents of the press, whose work was mediated through Giolito, 'per mezzo del cortese Giolito'. Giolito's productivity and success is frequently attributed to his ability to work with others. On his collaborators, see Nuovo and Coppens, pp. 104–07; Quondam, '"Mercanzia d'onore"', pp. 96–98; Claudia Di Filippo Bareggi, *Il mestiere di scrivere: lavoro intellettuale e mercato librario a Venezia nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1988).

[12] See Marino, 'Il paratesto'.

Petrarch is authorized. Assessing the significance of a title-page and letter to the reader alongside a commentary provides us with a different picture of the way in which multiple hands and minds have gone into the making of books. Giolito's name, his imprint, and his printer's device stand as representatives for a much wider, albeit largely anonymous, constituency connected to the publishing industry. In order to go some way towards mitigating against anonymity, and thus evidencing a more inclusive approach towards early modern book agents, I will argue that it is fruitful to apply a theory of collaborative authorship to the relationship between Petrarch, Vellutello, and Giolito, and thereby raise the profile of Giolito's activities, not only as a successful entrepreneur and businessman, but also as the author of carefully designed products (and as the figurehead of the many others who have played a part in that collaboration). Rather than read Giolito and his editorial collaborators as mediators who assume a lesser role in the authorization of Petrarch than commentators such as Vellutello, for example, I am suggesting that the work of publication is read as a form of active and collaborative authorship. Integral to my argument, and what distinguishes my position from that of many other discussions of print culture and paratext, is that we consider seriously – in relation to authorship – the visual, *designed* dimensions of the text-object, alongside the verbal aspects of paratexts.[13] The invention, selection, and organisation of paratextual material is an activity from which it is impossible to divorce aesthetic and pragmatic decisions regarding order, choice of typeface, and distribution of layout, and yet these are questions which are frequently disregarded in the critical literature in favour of an emphasis on the *content* of texts and paratexts.

[13] For an important parallel study which considers the relationship between visual design and paratexts, see Guyda Armstrong, 'Coding Continental: Information Design in Sixteenth-Century English Vernacular Language Models and Translations', *Renaissance Studies,* 29.1 (2015), 78–102.

This article makes a new contribution to the study of Petrarch, and to the study of early modern publishing, by exploring how the figure of the author was constructed through the publishing practices of Gabriele Giolito. Rather than focus on author-function in relation to the individual figure of Petrarch, I argue that the dissemination and reception of Petrarch's works should be understood as a collaborative enterprise which involves multiple agents brought together through Giolito's publishing house. It is the collective activity of book agents such as pressmen, editors, proofreaders, compositors, and so on, as well as commentators such as Vellutello, and the author (represented in this case by Petrarch's work) who together create the books which are marketed and consumed by reading publics. Viewed from this perspective, this article seeks to check the privilege accorded to canonical individuals which continues to shape – implicitly as well as explicitly – the teaching and research objectives of much of pre-modern Italian studies.[14] A shift in critical focus opens up new questions, which might not always lead to new answers about Petrarch, but which remind us that other cultural agents and activities are valid objects of study. This article is divided into two parts: the first part surveys selected theoretical and methodological approaches towards collaborative authorship located in medieval and early modern literary studies and translation studies in order to discuss in more detail how and why this is a useful approach to take, and how it dovetails with existing approaches in the humanities; in the second part I will apply the concept of collaborative authorship to a close reading of the paratextual design of Giolito's editions of Petrarch, based on a position in which Giolito's contributions are considered as valid as those of Vellutello or Petrarch.

[14] The canonical status of commentators is, of course, historically less secure than that of Petrarch. See for example, Belloni's view of Vellutello as a 'heretic': Gino Belloni, 'Un eretico nella Venezia del Bembo: Alessandro Vellutello', *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, 157 (1980), 43–74.

Collaborative authorship in theory and practice

What is collaborative authorship? Simply put, this is the recognition that authoring a literary text (or other work of art) is often, if not always, the result of more than one author. The most basic form of collaborative authorship is when two or more people set out to produce a piece of writing together. Sometimes it is impossible to know who has written which part in the finished piece; sometimes co-authorship is more visible when chapters of a book are authored separately and then fitted together, or when one author continues the work which has been begun by another. Collaboration does not have to be consensual, and can take place at different moments in time and space, when a text is completed or changed months, years, or even centuries after the first author's death.

Arguably the most important contribution that collaborative authorship makes to our understanding of cultural production is not the idea of multiple authors *per se*, but the fact that it enables us to bestow the title of 'author' onto individuals who in other circumstances are given different (less 'valued') titles. In one of the first extended analyses of authorial collaboration by Jack Stillinger, editors, translators, publishers, transcribers, and printers are explicitly named as potential co-authors.[15] In 1974, Howard S. Becker had laid the groundwork for Stillinger's study by pointing out that what makes one an artist (or an author) is a matter of consensual opinion rather than an objective reality. As an early adopter of sociological models, he argued that every work of art requires a network of people to bring it into being, and that our definitions of those acts of labour are placed in an arbitrary hierarchy.[16] However, nearly fifty years on, literary criticism still has a deep-seated

[15] Jack Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. v. Stillinger's case studies are taken from English-language authors; Chapter 7 is devoted to exploring the ways in which editors and publishers have made substantial and influential changes in American novels (pp. 139–62).
[16] Howard S. Becker, 'Art as Collective Action', *American Sociological Review*, 39.6 (1974), 767–76 (p. 769).

attachment to the image of the author, not only as an individual, but also as someone whose creativity is viewed as qualitatively different from that of an editor.

One of the most successful survivors from the theoretical turn of the last century is Michel Foucault's concept of the author-function. The principal aim of the 'author-function' was to replace the historical individual with a construct formed from the collectivist process of reading. The Romantic concept of an individual creative genius was re-situated as one possible version of authorship, rather than *the* version of authorship. Nevertheless, the notion of the author-function as an individual continues to persist within Foucault's somewhat inconsistent formulation.[17] Medieval studies might seem to be more open to the idea of collective forms of authorship, given the prevalence of multi-authored anthologies and the difficulty of attributing authorship to some texts. However, Foucault's rather sweeping and problematic statements about the anonymity of literary texts circulating in earlier periods have tended to encourage scholars to push for a narrative which emphasizes continuity with later periods, by locating the emergence of a 'modern' conception of the author in ever earlier centuries, rather than stimulating more study of collaboration.[18] Within Italian studies, the connection between authorship and elite 'authorial' qualities is nurtured by the dominance of Petrarch (together with Dante and Boccaccio), who presents himself as an ideal candidate for studies which explore the highly nuanced ways in which he defined himself and is defined by his texts as an individual author.[19] Focusing on the means by which authors self-authorized

---

[17] See Adrian Wilson, 'Foucault on the "Question of the Author": A Critical Exegesis', *The Modern Language Review*, 99.2 (2004), 339–63; especially pp. 357–58.

[18] See Foucault quoted in Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, trans. by Lydia G. Cochrane (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), p. 31; Chartier offers a corrective to Foucault's view in relation to the Italian tradition: see especially p. 58.

[19] See, for example, Olivia Holmes, *Assembling the Lyric Self: Authorship from Troubadour Song to Italian Poetry Book* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000); Albert Ascoli, *Dante and the Making of a Modern Author* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

and were authorized by others, it is easy to become entirely focused on the power of an individual. Thus, an exploration of the process of canonization can result in an even greater degree of canonization.

A facet of the history of authorship brought out by Foucault which does remind us of the significant differences between a modern conception of individual authorship and earlier conceptions, and underlines the value of exploring the publishing context, is found in studies exploring the intersection between literary-aesthetic and legal-economic discourses. Before the eighteenth century, authors did not hold any legal claim to ownership of their works; rather, it was publishers who owned literary property. The system of book privileges, which was developed precisely to help safeguard the financial status of authors and printers, is an extension of the patronage system, in as much as authors and printers are granted exclusive rights to their own work for a defined length of time.[20] Thus, from an early modern perspective, authors are not necessarily an enduring element of the literary project, and the successful future of the text lies in the hands of its publishers rather than its author.

Within modern languages, translation studies has made significant contributions to the concept of collaborative authorship.[21] Research within the medieval and early modern

---

[20] Mark Rose, 'The Author as Proprietor: *Donaldson v. Becket* and the Genealogy of Modern Authorship', *Representations*, 23 (1988), 51-85 (p. 55). On the later emergence of Italian copyright law, see *Manuale enciclopedico della bibliofilia*, ed. by Vittorio Di Giuro (Milan: Bonnard, 1997), pp. 70–72. See also an episode from sixteenth-century English publishing in which the printer-publisher John Wolfe constructs a context for his pirated editions of Machiavelli and Aretino based on their inheritable publishing rights: Joseph Loewenstein, 'For a History of Literary Property: John Wolfe's Reformation', *English Literary Renaissance*, 18 (1988), 389–412; Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), especially Chapter 1: 'Print Matters', pp. 17–45 (pp. 30–33).

[21] See for example, the two-volume collection which is dedicated to exploring multiple agencies within the context of compositional and publishing practices: *Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation 1: Collaborative Relationships between Authors, Translators, and Performers*, ed. by Hanne Jansen and Anna Wegener (Montréal: Editions québecoises de l'oeuvre, 2013); *Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation 2: Editorial and Publishing Practices*, ed. by Hanne Jansen and Anna Wegener (Montréal: Editions québecoises de l'oeuvre, 2013).

practices of translation has highlighted the ways in which theoretical assertions that translation must be performed by a single translator, and that the translation text must offer a univocal version, have obscured the common practice of translation teams working together on the same text.[22] Translation can also be an act of collaboration when the translated text is viewed as a creative text in its own right, acknowledging that the translator operates in the same creative mode as the author of the source text.[23] This approach exposes the process by which we apply the labels marking people as 'authors' or 'translators' as reductive, and relatively arbitrary. Petrarch's translation of the final tale of Boccaccio's *Decameron* into Latin is a good example of this kind of collaborative authorship: in this case, Petrarch's relatively free rewriting clearly involves what we traditionally consider to be authorship, while the interlingual transfer from Italian to Latin marks his work simultaneously as translation.[24] From the perspective of collaborative authorship, the work is the product of a collaboration between Boccaccio's source text and Petrarch's own contribution.

Rita Copeland's magisterial body of work on composition and translation offers a powerful argument for the value of exploring the intersections between practices and disciplines which are often siloed into separate categories.[25] She argues that rhetorical *inventio* and hermeneutical *enarratio* are not distinct, but are overlapping categories, creating

[22] Belén Bistué, 'The Task(s) of the Translator(s): Multiplicity as Problem in Renaissance European Thought', *Comparative Literature Studies*, 48.2 (2011); Belén Bistué, *Collaborative Translation and Multi-Version Texts* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).
[23] Deborah Uman and Belén Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship: Margaret Tyler's *The Mirrour of Princely Deedes and Knighthood*', *Comparative Literature Studies*, 44.3 (2007), 298–323.
[24] See Kenneth P. Clarke, 'On Copying and Not Copying *Griselda*: Petrarch and Boccaccio', in *Boccaccio and the European Literary Tradition*, ed. by Piero Boitani and Emilia Di Rocco (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2014), pp. 57–71. On p. 63, Clarke notes that Griselda is 'a "scrittura a quattro mani", the result of a dialogic, collaborative co-authorship'.
[25] Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

a space in which translation could be defined.[26] Translation is thus not treated as a separate activity, but as embedded and intertwined with a literary practice which contains elements of both authorial agency and exegesis. Her case studies include Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women* and Gower's *Confessio amantis*, defined as 'secondary translations', thus reminding us that translations can present themselves so successfully as independent textual productions that they comfortably occupy places within the modern canon, and we do not hesitate to refer to the names attached to them as authors (rather than as translators).

Copeland's work is part of a broader re-evaluation of medieval literary theory, which began in the 1970s, and has major implications for the study of literary commentaries.[27] This body of scholarship no longer views commentary as a fixed storehouse of information and ideas which passively accompanies a text, but rather as a dynamic and productive force which actively seeks to displace it. From this perspective, commentary is no longer read as subservient and supplementary, but as a category of text which contains the rhetorical force of invention, such that commentators can assume the same prestige of authorship that might be accorded to Chaucer, or indeed to Petrarch. The fact that many of these 'modern' authors also compiled commentaries on other moderns, and even authored their own commentaries for their own works, blurs the rather artificial lines that we might otherwise be tempted to draw between commentators and authors.[28] Within Petrarch studies, this has led to research

[26] See in particular, the synthetic overview of this position in the introduction and especially p. 3.
[27] Other contributors include Judson B. Allen, Paule Demats, Peter Dronke, A. J. Minnis, Glending Olson, Brian Stock, and Winthrop Wetherbee; see Copeland, p. 4, n. 3.
[28] See 'The Transformation of Critical Tradition: Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio' in *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism, c. 1100-c. 1375: The Commentary Tradition*, ed. by A. J. Minnis and A. B. Scott with the assistance of David Wallace, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), which discusses Dante's self-commentary in the *Vita nova* and *Convivio*; Boccaccio's self-commentary in the *Teseida*; and Gower's self-commentary in the *Confessio amantis*.

dedicated to the authorship invested in commentaries on Petrarch,[29] although there is still an active debate about the degree to which commentators are seen as useful for reconstructing the socio-historical context of Petrarch's authorship rather than as authors in their own right, with texts worthy of philological analysis.[30] William Kennedy's foundational studies are based on the recognition that commentary shapes access to the text, but nevertheless retain a hierarchical distinction between 'major' commentaries, which have a coherent and unifying ideological message, and notes and other 'tools for the reader', which are not incorporated within the 'canon' of commentators.[31] Collaborative authorship provides a methodological space within which we can recognize the ways in which individual notes and glosses *and* full-length commentaries shape access to a text, while acknowledging different degrees of engagement on behalf of both commentators and consumers.

English studies has a longer tradition of exploring the ways in which editors and publishers, as well as translators, contribute to authorship.[32] Much of this work, however, continues to emphasize collaborative work on the verbal content of texts, without considering the wider implications of the visual, designed, text-object. An exception is Stephen Dobranski's treatment of Milton's relationship with the seventeenth-century book trade.[33] One of Dobranski's key questions focuses on the ways in which the material creation of Milton's books affected their meaning, drawing on Jerome McGann's emphasis on

---

[29] For a comprehensive list of studies, see the bibliography listed with *PERI* <http://petrarch.mml.ox.ac.uk/bibliography> [accessed 2 September 2019].
[30] See Leonardo Francalanci, 'I "*Trionfi* con il commento di Bernardo Ilicino" o il "*Commento* di Bernardo Ilicino ai *Trionfi*"?: alcune riflessioni metodologiche dalla periferia del canone petrarchesco', *Petrarchesca*, 3 (2015), 75–87.
[31] Kennedy: 'The ten commentaries that I have identified as major represent only a fraction of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century notes and glosses on Petrarch's *Rime sparse*. For reasons that I explore in Chapter 2, they are more systematic, detailed, and ideologically expressive than other random or incomplete interpretive aids that followed their lead.', p. 4.
[32] See the review article: Heather Hirschfeld, 'Early Modern Collaboration and Theories of Authorship', *PMLA*, 116.3 (2001), 609–22.
[33] Stephen Dobranski, *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

understanding the socio-historical conditions for textual production, as well as on Roger Chartier as a key proponent of book historical approaches.[34] Milton co-authored his texts in an environment in which print publication was fully established, even if not the only means of publication available.[35]

Naturally, Petrarch's own direct collaborations with book makers took place within fourteenth-century manuscript culture. Medieval textual composition is inherently collaborative in the way in which it incorporates sentences, sayings, and paraphrases of other texts, often extracted from anthologies or *florilegia* designed for this purpose.[36] There is a vast body of literature exploring the material conditions of Petrarch's authorship, nourished by the identification of manuscripts of the *Rvf* containing poems composed in Petrarch's own hand, alongside numerous comments in his letters which reveal strongly-held beliefs and

---

[34] Dobranski's study of Milton surveys the way in which previous studies of this author have privileged the notion of autonomous authorship and tend to resist incorporating the idea of collaboration. See, in particular, pp. 5–9.

[35] Scribal publication continued well into the seventeenth century: see Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Brian Richardson, *Manuscript Culture in Renaissance Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). A similarly powerful example from within Italian studies of a collaboration between a living author and a publisher is Pietro Aretino, although his relationship with the press has not been explored as collaborative authorship. See Amedeo Quondam, 'Nel giardino del Marcolini: un editore veneziano tra Aretino e Doni', *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, 97 (1980), 75–116; Fabio Massimo Bertolo, *Aretino e la stampa: strategie di autopromozione a Venezia nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Salerno Editrice, 2003).

[36] See Vincent Gillespie, 'From the Twelfth Century to *c*. 1450', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Volume 2: Middle Ages*, ed. by Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson (2005), pp. 145–235, especially section 3 on 'Reading for the Sense: Florilegia, Friars and the Rise of the Compiler', pp. 178–86. Gillespie notes that: 'Petrarch's Tibullus allusions may derive from the *Florilegium gallicum*' (p. 180). The practice continued across Europe into later centuries, joining together the activities of reading and writing, creating and receiving. For examples from the extensive literature on English commonplace books, see Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); Max W. Thomas, 'Reading and Writing the Renaissance Commonplace Book: A Question of Authorship?', in *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*, ed. by Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), pp. 401–15.

preoccupations with the making and distribution of texts in book form.[37] However, this has been directed almost entirely towards a celebration of Petrarch's achievements as an individual author and innovator. Despite the identification of the scribe with whom Petrarch worked closely, Giovanni Malpaghini is not considered a co-author, and indeed is more often treated as the passive recipient of Petrarch's instructions.[38]

H. Wayne Storey's substantial and significant body of work dedicated to the 'visual poetics' of Petrarch's texts creates a space in which the discussion of co-authorship might be nurtured.[39] Central to Storey's concept of visual poetics is the integration of verbal and visual codes of meaning. The verbal composition and visual presentation of texts by Guido Guinizzelli or Petrarch, for example, were affected by their authors' knowledge of the process of textual transmission. In other words, Storey argues, authors recognized that the scribal presentation of a text actively impinges on its interpretation.[40] Thus, the meaning of a

---

[37] For example, Berthold Louis Ullman, *The Origin and Development of Humanistic Script* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1960); H. Wayne Storey, 'Petrarch's Concepts of Text and Textual Reform', in *Transcription and Visual Poetics in the Early Italian Lyric* (New York: Garland, 1993), pp. 201–24; *Il codice degli abbozzi: edizione e storia del manoscritto Vaticano Latino 3196*, ed. by Laura Paolino (Milan: Ricciardi, 2000); Furio Brugnolo, 'Libro-d'autore e forma-canzoniere: implicazioni grafico-visive nell'originale dei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*', in Francesco Petrarca, *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta: edizione integrale in facsimile del manoscritto Vat. Lat. 3195*, ed. by Gino Belloni and others (Rome-Padua: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana-Antenore, 2003), pp. 105–29; Marco Pacioni, 'Visual Poetics e mise en page nei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*', *Letteratura italiana antica*, 5 (2004), 367–83; Paola Vecchi Galli, 'Il manoscritto, il *Canzoniere*, le *Rime disperse*', in Francesco Petrarca, *Trionfi, rime extravaganti, codice degli abbozzi*, ed. by Vinicio Pacca, Laura Paolino, Marco Santagata (Milan: Mondadori, 2006), pp. 15–90; Giuseppe Savoca, *Il 'Canzoniere' del Petrarca tra codicologia e ecdotica* (Florence: Olschki, 2008).

[38] See, for example, Robert Durling's assumptions in relation to format: Durling, '*Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*: From Manuscript to Print', *Humanist Studies & the Digital Age*, 1.1 (2011), 50–65 (pp. 53–54).

[39] Key works by Storey include: *Transcription and Visual Poetics in the Early Italian Lyric* (New York: Garland, 1993); 'All'interno della poetica grafico-visiva di Petrarca', in Francesco Petrarca, *'Rerum vulgarium fragmenta', cod. Vat. Lat. 3195: commentario all'edizione in fac-simile*, ed. by Gino Belloni and others (Rome: Antenore, 2004), pp. 131–71; '*Canzoniere* e petrarchismo: un paradigma di orientamento formale e materiale', in *Il petrarchismo*, ed. by Chines, I, 291-310; *Petrarchive* <http://dcl.slis.indiana.edu/petrarchive/> [accessed 2 September 2019].

[40] Storey, *Transcription and Visual Poetics*, p. 157

text does not reside wholly and exclusively in the words invented by its author (or authors), but is also located in the design of the text-object. Writing about the growth of copyists in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Storey briefly acknowledges that scribes might be defined as co-authors: 'for better or for worse, this professional-political class of "writers" became the linguistic and structural interpreters, if not virtual "coauthors," of literary works in the vernacular.' Here, however, the term 'coauthor' refers to an earlier use by Segre dating from the mid-1980s, and is not used consistently as a pivotal point of reference.[41] Rather than incorporating the evidence for the impact of scribes on the meaning of texts into a concept of collaborative authorship, Storey falls back on the traditionally antagonistic relationship between authors and editors, in which editorial work is seen as a threat to the purity of the authorial text.[42]

Collaborative authorship enables us to recognize that when Petrarch copies out his own works he is acting as a scribe and an editor, as well as an author and a publisher (assuming that he intends the work to be circulated in public). Indeed, it is virtually impossible to be an author and not an editor, and therefore very difficult to be an editor without being an author, since any changes that are made – either to the text or to the presentation of the text – will have an impact on interpretation. The question of the degree to which the 'interactions' commonly defined as editorial constitute authorship is as subjective as the traditional attribution of authorship. Adopting a critical position which is centred on

---

[41] Storey, *Transcription and Visual Poetics*, p. 11, n. 23; Cesare Segre, 'Oralità e scrittura nell'epica medioevale', in *Oralità: cultura, letteratura, discorso: atti del convegno internazionale (Urbino 21-25 luglio 1980)*, ed. by Bruno Gentili and Giuseppe Paioni (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1985), 19-35 (p. 29).

[42] For example: 'This book charts also the development of the medieval Italian poetry book as a vehicle for *protecting* the author's poetic constructions against editorial changes in transmission', *Transcription and Visual Poetics*, p. xxiv (my emphasis). It is important to draw a distinction between Petrarch's personal views, in which scribes are seen as agents of corruption, and the critical concept of authorial collaboration which is a theoretical and methodological tool for re-framing the question of authorship.

collaboration is an acknowledgement that there is scope within the process of authorship for contributions of different quantities and qualities; discussion does not need to be reduced to a competition about who makes the most valuable or 'authorial' contribution, but should ensure that we take into account all those who have had a hand – in larger or smaller measures – in the process of making a book. The value of reviewing the terminology is therefore not a sterile exercise in semantics, but an active prompt to analyse the ways in which material-visual decisions affect interpretation of the text.

Collaboration and co-creation are not confined to the moment of invention or during the drafting and first publication of a text, whether scribal or printed. When publishers make books that mediate the texts of authors who are deceased and no longer able to take a direct role in the process of authoring an edition, there may be greater freedom for publishing agents to exercise their intellectual freedom and it is critically easier to discern the impact of decisions which are not made in direct collaboration with the author, but indirectly across the space of decades or even centuries. Indeed, Amedeo Quondam attributes an increase in mediation in relation to classical texts published by Giolito, such that it becomes difficult to distinguish between authors and editors, although he does not follow through the implications of this comment to arrive as far as collaborative authorship.[43] The critical fortunes of the so-called 'poligrafi' who worked closely alongside Giolito as editors and translators, but also as authors and publishers of their own works, have suffered in large part because of their association with the commercial activity of publishing. This has begun to change only in the last decades, including recent research discussing Francesco Sansovino's editorial work on Dante as a form of authorship.[44]

---

[43] Quondam, '"Mercanzia d'onore"', p. 95. See also comments on the difficulty of distinguishing between authorial and editorial contributions in the context of Aretino's work with the publisher Marcolini in Quondam, 'Nel giardino', p. 89.

[44] Zoe Langer, 'More is More: Francesco Sansovino's Editorial Additions as a Form of Authorship on Dante's *Commedia* (1564), in *Minor Publishers in the Renaissance*, ed. by

The maturation of book history, with its interests in the material conditions of writing, publishing, and reading, has enabled editors and publishers to assume greater prominence within the critical field. At the same time, the figure of the author has been resuscitated from death and restored with a greater understanding of his or her dependencies and constraints.[45] Bourdieu's concept of the field of production comes the closest to providing a single model that takes into account the conditions of a work's production and reception which encompass the principles of collaboration. Bourdieu is critical of the structuralist residue which lingers in Foucault's formulation of the author-function, and which does not provide a clear picture of what the critic wishing to interrogate the author-function should actually study. His own conception of the field of production arguably sets out a clearer blueprint for applications of study. The theoretical ground for an acknowledgement of the material conditions of publication, and therefore for the agency of publishing agents, is prepared in this concise formulation, offered in the 1990s:

> the sociology of art and literature has to take as its object not only the material production but also the symbolic production of the work, i.e. the production of the value of the work or, which amounts to the same thing, of belief in the value of the work. It therefore has to consider as contributing to production not only the direct producers of the work in its materiality (artist, writer, etc.), but also the producers of the meaning and value of the work – critics, publishers, gallery directors and the whole set of agents

---

Angela Dressen, Susanne Gramatzki, Berenike Knoblich in *kunsttexte.de*, 2 (2017) <www.kunsttexte.de> [accessed 23 August 2019]; see also Di Filippo Bareggi, *Il mestiere di scrivere*. In the context of modern publishing, Nathalie Mälzer evaluates the degree to which proofreaders and designers leave their mark on the meaning of the text in her 'Head or Legs? Shifts in Texts and Paratexts brought about by Agents of the Publishing Industry', in *Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation 2*, ed. by Jansen Wegener, pp. 153–76.

[45] See, especially, Roger Chartier's discussion of 'Figures of the Author' in his *Order of Books*, pp. 25–60; for discussion which relates specifically to Petrarch, see p. 52 (author portraits); p. 55 (the *libro-autore*), p. 57 (manuscripts of the *Triumphi*).

> whose combined efforts produce consumers capable of knowing and recognizing the work of art as such.[46]

With this theoretical acknowledgement of the role played by publishers, in particular, in the production of meaning and value, I will go on to provide a practical example of the way in which Giolito and his agents co-author the Petrarch editions published between 1544 and 1560. I will focus principally on the ways in which Giolito adapts and shapes Vellutello's own presentation of Petrarch's text.

Giolito's paratextual design of Petrarch: 1544 to 1560

In the mid-sixteenth century, only a relatively small proportion of the population was a prospective book-buyer, and therefore Giolito needed to continue to sell books to the same public of readers in order to continue to increase his market share. In order to create a readership that would be faithful to the publishing house, and continue to buy its products, the identity of Giolito's brand needed to be visible and persuasive, readers needed to be confident of the quality of the products, and have a desire to read those texts.[47] Giolito's invention of the first planned series of works (the '*collana*') was a strategic method of encouraging readers to keep buying, but this was not envisaged until 1563. What has not been explored in the critical literature before now is the way in which Giolito designed his editions before 1563 by creating and organizing paratextual material beyond the printer's device in order to establish a strong identity for his publishing house, and prompt readers to continue to

[46] Pierre Bourdieu, 'The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed', in *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. and intro. by Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), pp. 29–73 (p. 37).
[47] Nuovo and Coppens, p. 109.

purchase copies of a text which they might already own in a different format and/or with different paratexts.

Giolito's publications of the *Rvf* and *Triumphi* are produced in three different formats, which are summarized in a letter to the readers signed by Giolito himself and printed in 1553–1554:

> Ecco benignissimi Lettori, che per uguale commodità di tutti, noi ue l'habbiamo date, prima con i loro Spositori; cioè co commenti del Vellutello, e poi del Gesualdo. Appresso habbiamo uoluto darui il testo puro nella forma di ottauo; et hora ui si da il medesimo per maggior commodo nella piu picciola di dodici, tanto piu corretto del primo e del secondo, che gia ui fu dato […] E perche niuna cosa manchi a pienamente sodisfarui, haurete nella fine di questi due testi ignudi, e senza apostille, alcuni dottiss. auertimenti di M. Giulio CAMILLO d'intorno ad alquanti luoghi delle Canzoni e de' Sonetti del uostro Poeta. Et oltre a cio uno Indice copiossimo del DOLCE da trouare agevolemente i concetti e le materie, che in Sonetto, o in Canzone, & anco ne Trionfi si contengono […].[48]

He thus distinguishes between editions which include a full commentary, 'naked texts' which do not include any commentary or notes, and a version in which the notes and indexes are included at the end of the volume, rather than surrounding the text (see Table 1, which groups editions by format). These three formats are introduced in stages during the sixteen-year

[48] 'Ai lettori Gabriel Giolito', fols A2^{r-v}; copy consulted: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Toynbee 212; CNCE 54783; USTC 847852. The letter is clearly aimed at a readership who not only wish to read Petrarch for pleasure, but also wish to imitate Petrarch's vocabulary and style in their own writings: 'Essendo le Rime di M. Francesco Petrarca care egualmente a tutti, e necessarie parimente a ciascuno, che procaccia di spiegare in versi bene e Leggiadramente i suoi pensieri […]' (fol. A2^{r}).

period, and overlap each other, which suggests that they are designed to be complementary rather than to work as replacements. The first editions, printed in 1544 and 1545, include the full commentary by Vellutello, which had been in circulation since the *editio princeps* of 1525 published by the Da Sabbio brothers. Gabriele's father, Giovanni Giolito, had also published Vellutello's commentary in 1538, together with Bartolomeo Zanetti and with the direct involvement of Vellutello, who is named in the colophon.[49] Gabriele's name does not appear in this edition, but it is more than likely that he was also involved. These editions in quarto format reprise the traditional medieval model of the commentated text where the commentary surrounds the poems on the same page. This first foray into Petrarch is a minimum-risk project: thanks in no small part to the efforts of Pietro Bembo and Aldo Manuzio several decades earlier, Petrarch's *rime* were already established as the models for vernacular lyric composition, and the frequency with which Vellutello's commentary had been reprinted since 1525 pointed towards its ready acceptance amongst reading publics.[50] Similarly, the model of the plain text, released from the overbearing presence of same-page commentary and notes, had been pioneered by Bembo and Aldo Manuzio in 1501, and popularized by printer-publishers like Niccolò Zoppino. Giolito brought out his first un-commented Petrarch in 1547 in the eminently portable duodecimo format. It takes a decade for him to bring out the third model, in which he adds a set of annotations composed by

---

[49] Francesco Petrarca, *Il Petrarca con l'espositione d'Alessandro Vellutello e con più utili cose diversi luoghi di quella novissimamente da lui aggiunte* (Venice: Bartolomeo Zanetti ad instantia di Alessandro Vellutello & Giovanni Giolito da Trino, 1538); USTC 847843; EDIT16 47365. <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ttkVdbD291IC&dq=vellutello&pg=PP5#v=onepage&q&f=false> [accessed 14 August 2019].

[50] Kennedy notes that before 1584, Vellutello's commentary experienced 'six major printings and twenty-three reprintings', p. 52. As a point of comparison, between 1525 and 1544, Gesualdo's commentary had been printed twice (1533; 1541); commentaries by Sebastiano Fausto da Longiano (1532), Sylvano da Venafro (1533), and Bernardino Daniello (1541) were published in single editions: this data is extracted from the USTC. Giolito publishes Gesualdo's commentary only once, in 1553.

Giulio Camillo, together with a more extensive set of 'indici' devised by Lodovico Dolce.[51] The latter part of the 1550s represents the most intensive phase of Petrarch publishing for Giolito, in which all three formats are republished.

In describing the various editorial formats, Giolito emphasizes the main features of each primarily in relation to the presence or absence of degrees of commentary, ranging from the 'commenti' to the 'testi ignudi senza apostille', through to the 'dottissimi avertimenti' and indice copiossimo'. In each case, the text is described as more 'corretto' than previously, but the paratexts are not ranked hierarchically in a manner which suggests that each new format is intended as a replacement for previous formats. Rather, Giolito stresses the inclusivity of his publishing ventures, which are intended to accommodate as many readers as possible, 'per uguale commodità di tutti'. It is not in his interests to compete with his own products. Instead, he is providing new opportunities to continue reading the text in different ways. By explicitly commenting on the different formats in this letter to the readers, he is implicitly advertising not only the latest product, but reminding his audience of his extensive back catalogue.

Table 2 is a visual overview of the variety of contents and organisation which exists across the three types of format printed by Giolito between 1544 and 1560, arranged in chronological order: editions including Vellutello's commentary are represented by editions published in 1544 and 1558; examples of editions without commentary or annotations are provided from 1548–1549 and 1557; and editions including Camillo's annotations and Dolce's indexes are represented by editions from 1553–1554 and 1560. Paratexts which originate within Giolito's print shop are marked in italic font. The number of paratexts varies

[51] On Dolce as an editor, see Susanna Villari, 'Strategie culturali di Dolce editore petrarchesco', in *Per Lodovico Dolce: miscellanea*, ed. by Paolo Marini and Paolo Procaccioli (Manziana: Vecchiarelli, 2016), pp. 317–63; Richardson, *Print Culture*, esp. pp. 114–17.

considerably between editions, but there is also a significant degree of continuity: each format opens with a set of paratexts authored by 'Giolito' which remain relatively static across time regardless of the type of commentary included (title-page; letter or dedication; portrait and sonnet).[52] As we will go on to see, the concentration of paratextual material linked to Giolito in the opening frontmatter renders his editions immediately recognizable and familiar (Table 2).

Against the familiarity of the opening paratexts, Giolito nevertheless finds ways to stimulate continued interest in his existing customer base. Comparing editions that belong to the same format, we see that Giolito introduced changes over time. The 1558 edition of Vellutello's commentary contains additional paratexts compared with the 1544 edition: a new certificate of Petrarch's coronation and a vernacular translation of Petrarch's will are inserted immediately following Vellutello's biographies of Petrarch and Laura. Giolito's additions continue Vellutello's project to provide information about the historical circumstances of Petrarch and Laura's lives, offering greater context to readers of the poems, whilst still providing a recognizable edition of Vellutello's commentary. This is a key part of Giolito's strategy to innovate and continue to find ways of satisfying his client-base and encourage new or repeat custom. In 1560 the coronation text and translation of the will also introduce the text annotated by Camillo and Dolce, showing how editions belonging to different formats cross-fertilize each other. Similarly, Vellutello's biography of Petrarch, which, as we will see below, is part of the paratext introducing his commentary, is adapted and included (without attribution) in editions advertised as annotated by Camillo and Dolce.

By 1560, the edition in quarto with Vellutello's commentary surrounding the text and the duodecimo edition of Camillo's annotations placed as endnotes continue to look quite

[52] In line with my earlier comments, I am using the name Giolito as a shorthand for the wider number of named and unnamed agents working within his publishing house.

different on the surface, but the way in which they are designed to be used has become so flexible that they may have attracted similar readerships. Marginal notes, described on the title-page as 'apostille', are added to the outer margins of Vellutello's commentary.[53] These provide mini-summaries of the glosses, sometimes summarising linguistic meanings or singling out reference to Latin authors and summarising the quotation in Italian. Readers would be able to move quickly through the commentated text, locating and re-locating points of interest. The notes could be used in place of the commentary, re-creating the equivalent of Camillo's endnotes, or used as an entry point to the commentary, encouraging even closer and deeper engagement. In a similar gesture towards a different format, the 1560 edition with Camillo and Dolce's paratextual apparatus is supplemented with a new 'spositione' by Dolce, which supplements rather than replaces the indexes still located at the end of the volume. The 'spositione', however, consists of a series of short summaries positioned on the same pages as Petrarch's poems in the manner of Vellutello's commentary. Rather than envisage entirely different types of reader for these different editions, we are reminded that it is in Giolito's interests as a printer-publisher to be as inclusive as possible in designing editions that can be used in multiple different ways.

Table 3 presents the layout and organisation of the *editio princeps* of Vellutello's commentary, alongside the material development of Giolito's editions, in order to evaluate in more detail how Giolito and his collaborators shaped the authorial contributions made by Vellutello, as well as by Petrarch two centuries earlier, into co-authored editions. In the *editio princeps*, the text of Vellutello's commentary is divided into multiple parts. In common with

[53] Dolce's 1555 edition of Dante's *Commedia* had also included marginal annotations, announced on the title-page as 'Apostille nel margine' and listed in a separate table: 'Tavola delle apostille che sono nel margine de tutta la opera' (Venice: Gabriele Giolito); CNCE 808793; EDIT16 1170. This pocket-sized edition in duodecimo format replaces traditional full-text commentaries with short summaries and *allegorie*. See Simon Gilson, *Reading Dante in Renaissance Italy: Florence, Venice and the 'Divine Poet'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), pp. 225–33.

conventions established with medieval commentaries, the exegesis which is linked most closely to the text is printed on the same pages as Petrarch's lyrics, frequently surrounding them on three sides (upper, lower, and outer margins), and occasionally occupying an entire page. The commentary is printed in the same italic font, but in a smaller size to distinguish it from the main text. Although sections of text under discussion are marked in upper case, the layout does not encourage the piece-meal reading of glosses for individual lines, and is designed to be digested as chunks of commentary attached to individual poems, and ideally as a full-length text in its own right (Table 3).

The timings and geographical locations of Petrarch's love for Laura provide the driving force behind Vellutello's interpretive project. He is intent on bringing new coherence and understanding to Petrarch through anthropological investigations into Petrarch's life: he gleans information from Petrarch's letters and the writings of those around Petrarch, he goes to Avignon and Vaucluse to do his research 'on the ground', gaining first-hand knowledge from those who may have known Petrarch. The fruits of his research find expression in a woodcut map, biographies of both Petrarch and Laura, and the decision to divide the poems into three sections based on their connection to the chronology of Petrarch and Laura's relationship (poems composed during the life of Laura, composed after her death, and poems on subjects not related to Laura).[54] The coherence of Vellutello's desire to retrieve narrative threads from within Petrarch's lyrics and align these with the extratextual information he gathered from his research to form a new reading, offers itself readily to a critical

[54] On Vellutello's commentary, see Gino Belloni, 'Alessandro Vellutello', in *Laura tra Petrarca e Bembo,* pp. 58–95; Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch*, pp. 45-52; Catharina Busjan, *Petrarca-Hermeneutik: die Kommentare von Alessandro Vellutello und Giovan Andrea Gesualdo im epochalen Kontext* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013); on the map and its fortunes, see Ernest H. Wilkins, 'Vellutello's Map of Vaucluse and the *Carte de Tendre*', *Modern Philology*, 29.3 (1932), 275–80.

interpretation of Vellutello not simply as a commentator, but also as an author.[55] Furthermore, considering the material disposition of Vellutello's commentary within its first edition allows us to see the ways in which the ideological thrust of his project is the product of both his words and the organisation of those words into a text with a paratextual apparatus.

Before the reader arrives at the opening of Petrarch's text surrounded by commentary, he or she is presented with two quires' worth of preliminary material.[56] A rudimentary title-page presents the works of both Petrarch and Vellutello (*Le volgari opera del Petrarcha con la espositione di Alessandro Vellutello da Lucca*), the date of publication and references the existence of a privilege. A further list of privileges is included several pages in, and also an index of the first lines of sonnets and canzoni, which is a canonical element of Petrarch editions. The remaining paratextual frontmatter is directly authored by Vellutello, and is fundamental to the ideological concerns underpinning his glosses. Vellutello himself says in the 'Trattato dell'ordine' that he has deliberately subverted the usual order of procedures in favour of justifying his choice of structure for the *Rime*.[57] Rather than present a single proem or introduction, he offers a set of texts (topographical map, dedicatory proem, defence of the order of Petrarch's texts, biography of Petrarch, biography of Laura and description of Vaucluse, explanation of the tri-partite division), each with its own title,[58] which together describe and justify his aims and objectives. As authors and editors surround a text with

---

[55] Simon Gilson makes the case for attributing authorship to commentators in relation to Dante commentary in his 'Modes of Reading in Boccaccio's *Esposizioni sopra la Comedia*', in *Interpreting Dante: Essays on the Traditions of Dante Commentary*, ed. by Paola Nasti and Claudia Rossignoli (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013), pp. 250–82 (pp. 252–53).

[56] The first quire, signed AA, consists of 8 leaves; the second quire, BB, is made up of 4 leaves. The first sonnet and accompanying commentary begins the verso of the opening of the third quire (fol. A1v).

[57] See (fol. AA6^{v}): <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=caA1AMdR4ksC&dq=1525%20vellutello&pg=PA7#v=onepage&q=1525%20vellutello&f=false> [accessed 2 September 2019].

[58] The exception is the map, which has no title in this edition.

paratextual matter, such as dedications and prefaces, so Vellutello's preliminary matter is presented as a series of paratexts which guide the reader's introduction to the main text – consisting of Petrarch's poems entwined with Vellutello's exegesis –, providing the necessary context and rationale.

Turning once again to the 1544 edition with which we began, the net result of Giolito's editorial shaping of the 1525 edition is to concentrate the essence of Vellutello's message by omitting some parts and rearranging the order of the remaining sections, while at the same time promoting the identity of the publishing house. A new set of paratexts is added, which originate with Giolito. These bear a similar central message about the immortal love of Petrarch and Laura, overlaid with a message about their dependence on the printing press as the agent of their celebrity. Thus, the editions are constructed though a layered system, in which Petrarch's text remains at the core, surrounded in the first instance by Vellutello's paratextual apparatus, and secondly by the paratextual apparatus of Giolito and his collaborators. It is the combined effects of all of these paratexts that work to establish Petrarch's position within the canon.

Giolito removes Vellutello's proemial dedication to Martino Bernardini, and with it, some of Vellutello's power as an authorial agent.[59] The first text of Vellutello encountered by the reader is now his biography of Petrarch, although Vellutello's name does not appear again until the opening of the main commentary. First impressions of Vellutello's voice are thus as the narrator of historical information, rather than as a narrator speaking directly in the first person to set out his intentions regarding the textual project. Before arriving at the biography of Petrarch, the reader has already moved through several pages of paratext in which

[59] It is common practice amongst editors and printer-publishers to omit existing paratexts, and to add and re-order existing ones: the second edition of Vellutello's commentary printed by Bernardino Vitali in 1528 excludes the dedication to Bernardini; the 'Trattato de l'ordine' is first omitted in Vitali's edition of 1532; a new dedication addressed to Iacopo D'Oria is added to the 1538 edition published by Giovanni Giolito.

Giolito's identity is the dominant presence. Mapping the position and organization of paratexts across his Vellutello editions demonstrates that Giolito's additions remain a constant feature, and that they are most concentrated at the opening of each edition. This is a vital part of the way in which Giolito creates recognition for his publishing house. Readers who picked up an edition published by Giolito would be able to recognize his imprint from the contents and design of the frontmatter. The title-page is the most obvious visual example of Giolito's presence, symbolized by the printer's device, and we have already seen how this works to incorporate the presence of Giolito as a third essential partner in the making of the book.

The longer 'Trattato de l'ordine', in which Vellutello is able to set out the logic for his decisions in some detail, is also removed, leaving the much shorter and more functional description of the new structure in the 'Divisione de son. e de le canz.'. Of Vellutello's paratextual apparatus, the sections which remain are re-ordered to focus on a tri-part, symmetrical arrangement of life of Petrarch, map, and life of Laura.[60] The short and perfunctory description of the structure is added to the end of Laura's biography, and thus seems to be treated as a note rather than a more substantial text. In contrast, both the biographies and the map are assigned greater visual status, with each bearing a title in an uppercase font and opening at the head of a new page.[61] In the *editio princeps* the map occupied two leaves, but in the Giolito editions it has been recut to occupy a single leaf. Its new proximity to the lives of Petrarch and Laura makes it easier for readers to locate the

[60] In the copy digitized for Google Books from the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Rome the map is missing. My description is based on the copy I have seen in the British Library, London (C. 27. e. 19).

[61] In the *editio princeps*, Vellutello's paratexts follow on immediately from each other; thus, for example, the life of Petrarch opens half way down the page and the map does not have a caption.

places named in the biographies, and also metaphorically connects the lovers and roots their experience in the landscape of Vaucluse.

Immediately following the title-page is a letter to the readers signed by Domenichi, which replaces Vellutello's proem dedication. Where Vellutello's proem staged an intimate conversation between the author of the commentary and a privileged individual dedicatee on which reading publics could eavesdrop, Domenichi's letter addresses an unlimited audience of current and future readers, directly inviting them to participate in the experience of consuming a product for which they must be indebted to Giolito. The emphasis in the letter is less on justifying the rationale for the verbal contents of the edition (the combined authorities of Petrarch and Vellutello require little introduction at this date) and focuses instead on drawing attention to the quality of the material presentation of the book, attributed to the activities of Giolito's publishing house.[62]

The introduction of medallion portraits for vernacular authors is a key part of this strategy of authorizing moderns. The classical tradition is present in the echo of ancient medals and coins containing images of great men in profile, and in the ancient symbolism of the laurel crown. The visual portrait plays on the idea that the biographical apparatus which accompanied authorities such as Virgil and Ovid represented a written portrait of the author (and usually included a description of the author's physiognomy).[63] Printed portraits were not

---

[62] Fol. A2^{r} (1544): 'Ma perche tra molti, che l'esercitano colui di maggior lode e degno, che piu eccellentemente nell'artificio s'affatica, io ueramente stimo, che tra i rari impressori meriti grado illustre (Et sia detto con pace de glialtri) l'honorato M. Gabriel Giolito) […] se uiuessero hoggi gli authori, de iquali egli ha con tanti ornamenti l'opre impresse, che ciascuno di loro a prova di se medesimi cercarebbono d'auanzare se stessi ne i propri sudori: solo per uedere i parti de li loro intelletti si leggiadramente honorati & posti in mano de gli huomini per mezzo del cortese Giolito.'

[63] The *topos* that the face is the image of the mind derives from Cicero's *De oratore,* III. lix. 221. Erasmus famously commissioned a portrait medal of himself in 1519, with the Latin inscription on one side: 'portrait executed from life'; and in Greek on the other side: 'his writings will present a better image'. See the image (Figure 12) in Raymond B. Waddington, *Aretino's Satyr: Sexuality, Satire, and Self-Projection in Sixteenth-Century Literature and Art*

an innovation invented by Giolito, but the author portrait, often accompanied by a praise poem, becomes a key part of his authorizing strategy and a recognizable feature of his publishing programme.[64] Gabriele's father, Giovanni, included classicizing medallion author-portraits of both Dante and Petrarch on the title-pages of his editions, published respectively in 1536 and 1538.[65] Gabriele's 1542 edition of Boccaccio's *Decameron* replicates this earlier practice and positions a portrait of Boccaccio in the same style on the title-page. In the same year, the younger Giolito's edition of Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* marks the first instance of the author-portrait combined with a praise poem 'Sonetto di M. Lodovico Dolce in lode di M. Lodovico Ariosto'.[66] Significantly, Ariosto's portrait is no longer included on the title-page, but is moved to the backmatter (fol. KK4v).[67] On the title-page, in a medallion-shaped space,

(Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), p. 59; see also Steven Rendall, 'The Portrait of the Author', *French Forum*, 13.2 (1988), 143–51 (pp. 144–47).

[64] It seems likely that Dolce authored the sonnet for the 1544 edition. The first portrait of an author included in a printed book was published in 1479: see Ruth Mortimer, 'The Author's Image: Italian Sixteenth-Century Printed Portraits', *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 7.2 (1996), 11–12; Giuseppina Zapella, *Il ritratto nel libro italiano del Cinquecento*, 2 vols (Milan: Editrice bibliografica, 1988). The 1529 edition of Dante's *Commedia* (Venice: Jacopo da Borgofranco for Luc' Antonio Giunta) contains a title-page composed of portraits of five classical authors facing five modern authors, including Petrarch facing Horace, which provides a concrete visualization of the relationship between ancients and moderns. Giolito may have been influenced by the woodcut portrait of Ariosto designed for the 1532 *Orlando furioso* (Ferrara: Francesco Il Rossi) USTC 810531; EDIT16 2566 and/or by portraits of Aretino produced in the 1530s: see Waddington, Chapter 3: 'The Better Image: Portraits in Words, Wood, and Bronze', pp. 57–90.

[65] *Comedia con la dotta & leggiadra spositione di Christophoro Landino* (Venice: per Bernardino Stagnino ad instantia di Giovanni Giolito, 1536) USTC 808785; EDIT16 1162; *Il Petrarcha con l'espositione d'Alessandro Vellutello* (Venice: Bartolomeo Zanetti ad instantia di Alessandro Vellutello & Giovanni Giolito, 1538) USTC 847843; EDIT16 47365.

[66] See bibliographical description at *L''Orlando furioso' e la sua traduzione in immagini* <http://orlandofurioso.org> [accessed 28 August 2019].

[67] On the relative position of paratexts in front- and backmatter, see Rhiannon Daniels, 'Squarzafico's *Vita di Boccaccio* and Early Modern Print Culture: A New Model for the Study of Biography', in *A Boccaccian Renaissance: Essays on the Early Modern Impact of Giovanni Boccaccio and his Works*, ed. by Martin Eisner and David Lummus (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2019), pp. 112–50 (p. 128).

is now Giolito's phoenix atop an urn, metaphorically and literally substituting the author-portrait for a publisher-portrait.[68]

In this context, the position of Petrarch's portrait within the frontmatter of Giolito's editions appears as a significant design choice (rather than simply following an earlier precedent), as is the fact that it is not a simple author-portrait, but a double-portrait of Petrarch together with Laura (see Figure 2).[69] The image of Petrarch is connected to his earlier incarnation as a humanist in the 1538 edition because he is shown in profile, gazing towards the left-hand side of the page and wearing a laurel wreath. Here, he is transformed into the image of the amorous poet, and it is the shape of Vellutello's paratexts which necessitates the double-portrait: the dual lives of Petrarch and Laura which preface the commentary are introduced through a joint visualization which anticipates and introduces the biographies.[70] Both the image and the biographies illustrate that in Vellutello's commentary Laura is defined as a historical presence to complement that of Petrarch. That the decision to create a dual portrait is not simply related to the theme of Petrarch's love lyrics, but rather is connected precisely to Vellutello's emphasis on providing biographical details about Laura as well as Petrarch, is borne out by the absence of comparable joint portraits for Dante and Beatrice, or Boccaccio and Fiammetta. Giolito's 1546 edition of the *Decameron* presents a

---

[68] See image in the Newberry copy, which has been hand-coloured: *Newberry Digital Exhibitions: 'Orlando furioso'* <https://publications.newberry.org/digitalexhibitions/exhibits/show/frenchrenaissance/royal/item/163> [accessed 2 September 2019]. Nuovo also comments 'al comparire della Fenice, nessun altro ritratto di autore verrà pubblicato sul frontespizio ma sarà di regola collocate nei preliminari' (Nuovo and Coppens, p. 131).

[69] On the history of images of Laura see J. B. Trapp, 'Petrarch's Laura: The Portraiture of an Imaginary Beloved', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 64 (2001), 55–192. Double portraits of Petrarch and Laura in profile and enclosed within a tomb can be traced back to fifteenth-century manuscripts (p. 114).

[70] On the transformation of Petrarch's image from humanist to lover, see Angelica Rieger, 'De l'humaniste savant à l'amoureux de Laura: l'image de Pétrarque dans l'iconographie française (XVe-XVIe siècle), in *Dynamique d'une espansion Culturelle: Pétrarque en Europe, XIVe au XXe siècle* (Paris: Champion, 2001), pp. 99–126.

portrait of Boccaccio on his own above the sonnet 'Sonetto di M. Lodovico Dolce in lode di M. Giovanni Boccaccio', and immediately before Sansovino's life of Boccaccio; similarly, Giolito's 1555 edition of the *Commedia* presents Dante on his own, with the accompanying sonnet 'Sonetto del Boccaccio in lode di Dante', followed by Dolce's life of Dante. Later editions of Petrarch which do not include Vellutello's commentary revert to a single portrait of Petrarch (Figure 2).[71]

Giolito's decision to avoid the use of a medallion shape and place the busts of Laura and Petrarch within the shape of a funerary urn is an ingenious way of pre-empting Vellutello's message about the conjoined immortality of Petrarch and Laura, while at the same time inserting his own message about the immortality – and thus the importance – of quality publishing ventures. The visual marketing strategy of the title-page and its verbal equivalent in Domenichi's letter are intimately connected to the dual portrait. The explicit link between these three paratextual devices is the small phoenix rising out of the top of the funerary urn amid tongues of flame and the publisher's motto 'semper eadem'. Like the phoenix which substitutes Ariosto's portrait on the title-page of the 1542 *Orlando furioso,* this is a reminder of the publisher's authority, and authorial stake in the edition. The phoenix hovers over and above its authorial collaborators – explicitly Laura and Petrarch, who

[71] See Table 1. Rival publishers quickly recognized the appeal of the double portrait, which was recut as a pair of medallion portraits facing each other and used to advertise the text more explicitly on the title-page. For example, see Vincenzo Valgrisi's 1560 edition of Vellutello's commentary, which also includes a new version of the lovers incorporated within a single frame above a sonnet, placed between Vellutello's biographies <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=3Kjc-TrRJfMC&dq=vellutello&pg=PT4#v=onepage&q&f=false> [accessed 2 September 2019]. The profiles of Petrarch and Laura on the title-page are now in reverse, indicating that a copy was made directly from the image in Giolito's editions. See also the title-page of Domenico Giglio's 1553 edition with Gesualdo's commentary: <https://books.google.no/books?id=dcAaRtfKqpYC&dq=gesualdo%20petrarcha&hl=it&pg=RA5-PA7#v=onepage&q=gesualdo%20petrarcha&f=false> [accessed 2 September 2019].

implicitly represent Vellutello – in an echo of the way in which Giolito's presence is both the background to and a dominant presence in the title-page.

As we have already seen, the phoenix was a powerful marketing device, whose symbolism was fully exploited by Giolito.[72] The mythical bird who lives for at least 500 years before combusting and recreating itself is a symbol of eternal renewal and life after death, with both pagan and Christian associations, as well as connections to the city of Venice. The funerary urn containing Laura and Petrarch is already prefigured in the device used on the title-page of the 1544 edition (and in other variations which appear throughout Giolito's catalogue) in which the phoenix is standing on top of a jar or urn of a more simplistic design.[73] Just over a decade later, in 1555, Giolito published a treatise on the myth of the phoenix, which included poems in his praise. Domenichi's letter to the readers included in the Vellutello editions is a less direct version of this same authorizing strategy, here filtered through and diluted by the collaboration with Petrarch and Vellutello. The sentiments expressed by Domenichi point directly towards the later publication, however, and remain focused on the themes of immortality and eternal glory. As Domenichi notes, if Petrarch himself were alive, he would be asking Giolito to publish his works in recognition of the power of (quality) publishers. Similarly, Domenichi emphasizes Giolito's dedication to gaining eternal glory for his authors. By linking the funerary urn explicitly with the printer's device, Giolito continues the themes addressed by Domenichi in the letter and underlines his own authority to confer immortality upon the lovers. Joining the phoenix with a funerary urn perhaps also hints at recognition that Giolito is not exempt from earthly death and is as dependent on the longevity of his publications for life after death as Petrarch and Laura.

[72] Nuovo and Coppens, pp. 129–37.
[73] In some earlier versions of Giolito's device the phoenix is standing on a winged globe.

Conclusion

Thanks to the scholarship that has been steadily growing in recent decades, any discussion of Petrarch's sixteenth-century influence must now negotiate the significant role played by authors of commentaries such as Alessandro Vellutello. Following this same trajectory, I hope to have shown how and why it is profitable to extend our treatment of Petrarch's reception contexts to the publishing industry. All readers of Petrarch in print were exposed to the texts and design decisions created and implemented by editors and printer-publishers, both in commentated and uncommentated editions. The value of focusing on a corpus of editions designed by the same publisher and which notionally transmit the same text highlights the degree of variation which exists within the different layers of paratextual apparatus, even – or perhaps especially – when this involves the re-arrangement of the same set of paratexts. Thus, we are reminded that we can apply the same understanding of textual fluidity to paratext – be it commentary or a dedication – as we can to text.

To propose that we name all the agents who participate in the process of making a book 'authors' is not designed to empty the term 'author' of meaning, but to open up a more inclusive and wider horizon for scholarly investigation. The commercial aspects of publishing are difficult to disentangle from an early modern conception of authorship in which an individual author is viewed as part of the 'brand'. The value of Petrarch's authorship for Giolito and his contemporaries is thus a complex blend of attributes which might be aesthetically valuable in their own right but are also inherently marketable and 'owned' by Giolito's print shop.

This approach has implications both for the way in which we discuss the people involved in the process of authorship, and for the textual 'products' which they author. The study of paratexts is now sufficiently mature to have travelled significant distance from Genette's original definitions. Kathryn Batchelor's recent in-depth exploration of Genette's

definitions in relation to translation studies has continued to problematize the assumption that paratext must be aligned with authorial intention.[74] This has useful applications for the study of Petrarch's sixteenth-century reception, when it becomes increasingly challenging, and even reductive, to argue that Vellutello or Giolito are acting predominantly on behalf of the long-dead Petrarch. Similarly, Batchelor's list of paratextual micro-functions offers another way of evaluating the richness of Giolito's textual strategies.[75] His paratexts are ornamental, commercial, and instructive – working to decorate the text, advertise a product and attract a buyer's attention, and assist the reader in navigating the text; but they are also hermeneutical, ideological, and evaluative, exposing particular qualities of Vellutello's commentary and Petrarch's lyrics and promoting a specific viewpoint, as well as claiming value and cultural significance for the whole package.

The advent of print publication brought with it enhanced recognition of the individual author through the use of titling, biographies, portraits, and so on, which could accumulate around the figure of the author in the ways that we have explored above. However, print publication also created a generation of writers like Domenichi and Dolce, and publishers like Giolito, who were provided with more opportunities than ever before to author their own works.

---

[74] Kathryn Batchelor, *Translation and Paratexts* (London: Routledge, 2018), p. 14. See also *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. by Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[75] This list of 14 functions is revised from earlier work by Rockenberger on videogames and comprises: referential, self-referential, ornamental, generic, meta-communicative, informative, hermeneutical, ideological, evaluative, commercial, legal, pedagogical, instructive, and personalisation (Batchelor, pp. 160–61).